

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in the application, with Claims 1 and 5 being independent claims.

Claims 1, 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Uchida (U.S. Pat. No. 6,161,026).

Claims 5 and 11 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Seidensticker (U.S. Pat. No. 6,128,012).

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uchida in view of Cushman (U.S. Pat. No. 6,125,287).

Claim 10 is again rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidensticker.

It is gratefully acknowledged that Claims 6-9 remain allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), the Examiner states that Uchida anticipates each and every element of the claim. Amended Claim 1 teaches a key input method for diversifying key functions in a mobile telecommunication terminal. The method comprises detecting whether a user has input a key corresponding to a menu and offers the flexibility of *the key being any one of a plurality of keys provided on the mobile telecommunication terminal* as disclosed on lines 16-20, page 4 of the specification.

Meanwhile, Uchida discloses a method and a wireless selective call receiver for designating a specific item from a menu (Uchida, Claims 1 and 11). The wireless selective call receiver of Uchida includes a switch 10 as an operation element for selection of a menu (FIG.1, col. 3 lines 52-58, and col. 4 lines 12-14). The switch 10 of Uchida is a dedicated and only key that can be used for selection of a menu (col. 4 lines 12-14). By asserting “the wireless selective call receiver . . . using only a single switch” 10 (col. 7 lines 9-12), Uchida teaches away and fails to disclose anywhere the flexibility of *the key being any one of a plurality of keys provided on the*

mobile telecommunication terminal taught by Amended Claim 1.

Claim 1 patentably differs from Uchida.


Regarding the rejection of Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), the Examiner states that Seidensticker anticipates each and every element of the claim. Amended Claim 5 teaches a key input method for diversifying key functions in a mobile telecommunication terminal. The method comprises detecting whether an input state of a key set for a scroll function is maintained for a predetermined period of time and offers the flexibility of *the key being any one of a plurality of keys provided on the mobile telecommunication terminal*.

Meanwhile, Seidensticker discloses a portable device that has a dedicated keypad 36 including four buttons (an Action button 42, a Back button 44, an Up button 38, and a Down button 40) used to control the display and the functions of the device (FIG. 1, col. 5 lines 10-15). Seidensticker fails to disclose anywhere the flexibility of *the key being any one of a plurality of keys provided on the mobile telecommunication terminal* taught by Amended Claim 5.

Claim 5 patentably differs from Seidensticker.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-11, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

The Farrell Law Firm
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard
Suite 701
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel 516-228-3565
Fax 516-228-8475

PJF/DGL/mk